

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
Case No. 09-50026 (REG)

- - - - -x

In the Matter of:

MOTORS LIQUIDATION COMPANY, et al.
f/k/a General Motors Corporation, et al.,

Debtors.

- - - - -x

United States Bankruptcy Court
One Bowling Green
New York, New York

September 20, 2011
9:57 AM

B E F O R E:
HON. ROBERT E. GERBER
U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

1
2 HEARING re Debtors' Objection to Proof of Claim No. 45631 filed
3 by Steven Newman c/o Michael Green, Deceased
4

5 HEARING re Notice of Presentment of Proposed Order Granting
6 Motors Liquidation Company GUC Trust's Objection to Claim Nos.
7 39218, 39219, 39220, 39221, and 39222 for Failure to Comply
8 with Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. Section 105(a) and
9 General Order M-390 Authorizing Implementation of Alternate
10 Dispute Procedures Including Mandatory Mediation
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Transcribed by: Lisa Bar-Leib

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S :

WEIL GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

Attorneys for the Post-Effective Date Debtors and Motors

Liquidation GUC Trust

767 Fifth Avenue

New York, NY 10153

BY: JOSEPH H. SMOLINSKY, ESQ.

GARY, WILLIAMS, FINNEY, LEWIS, WATSON & SPERANDO, P.L.

Attorneys for Ryan Hawkins, as Personal Representative of

the Estate of Barbara Hawkins

221 East Osceola Street

Stuart, FL 34994

BY: DONALD N. WATSON, ESQ.

CHAN B. ABNEY, GENERAL COUNSEL & DIRECTOR

(TELEPHONICALLY)

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THE COURT: Motors Liquidation.

3 MR. SMOLINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. Joseph
4 Smolinsky of Weil, Gotshal & Manges for the post-effective date
5 debtors as well as for the Motors Liquidation Company GUC
6 Trust.

7 THE COURT: Thank you. Pause for a second, Mr.
8 Smolinsky. Do I have Donald Watson on the phone?

9 MR. WATSON (TELEPHONICALLY): Yes, Your Honor. Donald
10 Watson is here by phone. Also from my firm, we have Ms. Chan
11 Abney on behalf of Ms. Tanisha Gary. Donald Watson speaking
12 now.

13 THE COURT: All right. Gentlemen, I've read the
14 papers. I'll hear first from Mr. Smolinsky and then from you,
15 Mr. Watson.

16 MR. WATSON: Yes, sir.

17 THE COURT: This matter has been a source of
18 frustration to me. But reading the Watson firm's response, it
19 appears to me that there are two separate bases upon which I
20 have to grant Motors Liquidation's request. First, what seems
21 to be very strong and uncontroverted evidence that notice
22 repeatedly got to the law firm in some fashion. But even if we
23 put that aside, the underlying client's not being cooperative,
24 as you say, Mr. Watson -- even if you had responded fourteen
25 times over, you would have given me the same response you gave

1 on this motion. And although I don't like to penalize clients
2 for the acts of their lawyers, if I can avoid it, the fact is
3 that they had an ample opportunity to help themselves and
4 they're not cooperating and they made their own bed. That's
5 what I need both sides to address starting with you, Mr.
6 Smolinsky.

7 MR. SMOLINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. Mr. Watson and
8 his colleagues come from a fairly sizeable and reputable and
9 successful law firm. We therefore are not here seeking
10 sanctions against the firm. In fact, the only thing that we do
11 take issue with in their objection is the statement that they
12 didn't receive notice. The affidavit of service demonstrates
13 that not only did we send first-class mail -- by first-class
14 mail the objection, but we also sent the objection by e-mail to
15 Mr. Watson at the e-mail address that was indicated on the
16 proof of claim form.

17 Now the objection itself highlights the fact that the
18 clients of the firm have been less than cooperative in
19 participating in the mediation program. What Mr. Watson
20 describes as irreconcilable differences, I take issue with that
21 characterization. I don't think that there is a difference in
22 philosophy or legal strategy. I think it's just the fact that
23 the client has not complied with the terms of the ADR order.
24 It also is evident from the objection that the clients have
25 been made aware of the punitive nature of the expungement of

1 the claim that could result from failure to participate.

2 So I don't think that it would be fair or equitable to
3 the estate to allow the Hawkins' estate to have another bite at
4 the apple and to bring in new counsel as requested by Mr.
5 Watson. I believe that the statements made in the objection
6 relating to the lack of cooperation should be deemed to be
7 evidence or Mr. Watson could quickly put on a narrative of the
8 lack of cooperation and Your Honor should, based on that
9 testimony, expunge the claim.

10 THE COURT: Am I right from what you said that I don't
11 need to find anything vis-à-vis the Watson firm itself and I
12 can rely solely on the failure to cooperate by the underlying
13 claimants?

14 MR. SMOLINSKY: Your Honor, you've asked us to add a
15 paragraph to the order which requires the Watson firm to
16 appear. They obviously came in and called Your Honor prior to
17 entry of the order. And we're happy to strike that paragraph
18 from the order if Your Honor is inclined to do so, so that it
19 would be just a basic order which expunges the claim based on
20 the record of the hearing. But we would like Mr. Watson to
21 confirm again, as evidence, that there has been no cooperation
22 so we don't end up having to come back to court.

23 THE COURT: Well, Mr. Smolinsky, he put it in his
24 papers. And under my case management order, allegations in
25 motions are taken as true unless they're controverted. So if

1 you want -- I guess I could ask Mr. Watson to say it again, but
2 he already said it once in his papers, and that's part of the
3 record now, isn't it?

4 MR. SMOLINSKY: The only thing I'm concerned about,
5 Your Honor, is the statement in the objection that says there
6 are irreconcilable differences which would, in ordinary
7 circumstances, perhaps give rise to --

8 THE COURT: Require a motion to withdraw?

9 MR. SMOLINSKY: That's correct, Your Honor. And I
10 think that if we make a record that irreconcilable differences
11 is the fact that they won't appear when directed to do so by a
12 Court and not the difference of philosophy or legal strategy
13 then I'm fine relying on the rest of the objection as evidence.

14 THE COURT: Oh, fair enough. Mr. Watson, may I get
15 your perspective, please?

16 MR. WATSON: Yes, just briefly, Your Honor. Because
17 the Court had mentioned the possibility of referring the matter
18 to a disciplinary body, we just thought it necessary to just
19 confirm. We're not saying that the law firm did not give
20 service. But there was no direct -- no deliberate attempt or
21 deliberate failure or refusal to comply with the Court so I
22 just wanted the record to reflect that. But we do apologize.
23 Whatever the problem is and certainly with our law firm in
24 terms of the receipt of mail, that needs to be -- certainly
25 will be corrected.

1 With regard to the client's cooperation, I would just
2 reiterate that we have not been able to get that cooperation.
3 And there is, in fact, differences of philosophy but a
4 difference of philosophy in terms of how the case should be
5 resolved or should have been resolved. But for purposes of
6 this hearing, we will stand on our previous papers in terms of
7 the lack of cooperation from the client.

8 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Any desire to
9 reply, Mr. Smolinsky?

10 MR. SMOLINSKY: Your Honor, I am concerned about this
11 difference of philosophy. I don't want this order to be
12 challenged later based on a failure of Mr. Watson to adequately
13 represent the client's interest. I don't know how to square
14 that but I do want a clean order so that we could no longer
15 keep reserves for this claim. And perhaps simply putting in
16 the order that no reserves need to be made for this claim is
17 sufficient. And perhaps we should send a copy of the proposed
18 order to the client's address if Mr. Watson provides us with
19 that address and they could come into court and explain why
20 there's a difference of philosophy which would give rise to not
21 showing up at a mediation or refusing to cooperate.

22 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to grant Motors
23 Liquidation's motion with some refinements in the order. And
24 the following are my findings of fact and bases for the
25 exercise of my discretion.

1 First, I find that notice was duly provided to the
2 agent by, at the very least, e-mail and the efforts to
3 telephonically communicate the agent and by the presumption of
4 mailing which, while on occasion it can be refuted, has not
5 been refuted here.

6 But I further find that with appropriate notice, I
7 would have gotten the same response from the Watson firm that I
8 got on this motion which says, in substance, two things. One,
9 it says there are irreconcilable differences; but it also says
10 that the client isn't cooperating. And while I normally would
11 not, or at least would try not to penalize a client for counsel
12 error, here, as I indicated in my opening remarks, the
13 prejudice to the client that might otherwise result is the
14 client's own doing.

15 So the Motors Liquidation's motion is granted with the
16 following refinements:

17 You're to drop from the order any references to the
18 quality of representation by the Watson firm. I'm satisfied
19 that whatever might have happened before, any deficiencies were
20 cured and that the Watson firm did ultimately respond;

21 Second, you are to say expressly, if you wish, Mr.
22 Smolinsky, that the estate need not reserve funds on account of
23 this claim;

24 And, third, you are to provide that a copy of the
25 order is to be mailed both by first-class mail and by a

1 mechanism, either Federal Express or certified mail or whatever
2 you find most appropriate, that provides a proof of delivery.

3 And the effective date of this order will be three
4 weeks after the order is mailed to the underlying Hawkins
5 estate. I am not going to prejudge what I would do if suddenly
6 they decided that either they wanted to cooperate or they
7 wanted to appear. That's why we have a three-week gap in
8 effectiveness. I imagine the estate can reserve for another
9 three weeks.

10 I will hear from each of the two of you any
11 suggestions for further refining the order, but that's my
12 mindset, gentlemen. Mr. Smolinsky, first from you.

13 MR. SMOLINSKY: Your Honor, I presume that you would
14 like us to serve not only Mr. Watson but also the claimant
15 themselves. And I would only ask that Mr. Watson provide us
16 with the correct mailing address.

17 THE COURT: Well, certainly, it had been my thought
18 that it was going to go to both of them. Mr. Watson, my phone
19 system doesn't pass sound in two directions at the same time.
20 But I thought you wished to be heard.

21 MR. WATSON: I was just going to say that we'll
22 absolutely provide the address --

23 THE COURT: Okay.

24 MR. WATSON: -- for the claimant.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Any other mechanical matters that I

1 need to attend to, either side? Okay. Hearing none, does that
2 take care of Motors Liquidation for the day, Mr. Smolinsky?

3 MR. SMOLINSKY: No, Your Honor. There's one other
4 matter. Before we get to it, there's a housekeeping matter.
5 If you recall, when we had the Hawkins estate's motion on the
6 first time there was also another claim of the estate of Larry
7 Torres Rodriguez. You had a similar direction to us at the
8 prior hearing. We did send out a notice of proposed order with
9 the language that you asked us to include about having them
10 call chambers to explain why it shouldn't be turned over to the
11 grievance committee. As a courtesy, we called counsel after
12 that hearing. We actually spoke to another attorney in the
13 office who said that they would speak to the attorney in charge
14 and get back to us. We haven't heard anything. I don't know
15 if Your Honor has heard anything. But at this point, we'd like
16 to have Your Honor execute that order and we'll serve it with
17 the language that Your Honor directed us to.

18 THE COURT: It saddens me to have to do that but I
19 think that's exactly what I need to do, Mr. Smolinsky. So make
20 it happen.

21 MR. SMOLINSKY: We will submit it to chambers, Your
22 Honor.

23 The last matter on the agenda is an objection to the
24 claim of Steven Newman which is a representative for the estate
25 of Michael Green. On Friday, Your Honor received a letter

1 asking for an adjournment noting that Mr. Donovan, counsel to
2 the plaintiff, was on trial and couldn't make it. We have a
3 mandate from our client to resolve all the remaining claims
4 issues as quickly as possible. And Your Honor knows that we've
5 been doing that largely without the use of judicial resources.
6 But we do bring to your attention areas where there is some
7 concern.

8 We had agreed to adjourn this matter once before at
9 the request of Mr. Green. Of course, we did that -- Mr.
10 Donovan. Of course, we did that willingly. And we did it with
11 the tacit agreement that their objection -- their reply to the
12 objection would be filed no later than the 6th of September.
13 We would have a week to reply and then today would be the
14 hearing on the matter. Mr. Donovan agreed to those dates. It
15 was included in the notice of adjournment.

16 The 6th came and went. We didn't receive a response.
17 We then called Mr. Donovan, left a message; no response. We
18 left another message a day later. A secretary called back
19 saying that Mr. Donovan received the message but she couldn't
20 tell us anything about the circumstances. We then sent a
21 letter by FedEx to Mr. Donovan telling him that his failure to
22 respond would be treated as a default. Heard no response. And
23 then Friday, he sent a letter directly to you; did not reach
24 out to us for an adjournment.

25 Mr. Donovan is not here. Mr. Donovan is on trial in

1 New Jersey. We, of course, understand if Your Honor agrees to
2 adjourn this matter. However, this is a seventy-five million
3 dollar claim. Mr. Donovan's clients have already received
4 twenty-two million dollars in cash from the pre-petition
5 debtors on account of the claim. And we need to proceed
6 because a seventy-five million dollar claim does make an impact
7 on distributions to creditors. So we would ask Your Honor, if
8 Your Honor is inclined, to grant the request for an adjournment
9 to provide in that order of adjournment a specific deadline to
10 respond and a specific hearing date.

11 THE COURT: Yeah. I saw that letter and I sensed the
12 frustration. And I have it, too. I will authorize one final
13 seven-day extension. The order is to expressly provide there
14 will be no further extensions. And it's to expressly provide
15 that your opponent is to work nights or weekends to get it in
16 if he is busy during the daytime. I've had it with this. I am
17 fed up. Seven days from the date of entry. And if you give me
18 an order with that content today, it'll be entered today.

19 MR. SMOLINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. And we'll work
20 out a hearing date. Maybe we'll pick one and if he's not
21 available on that date, we'll come to chambers and get a quick
22 new date that works for both of us.

23 THE COURT: I understand. This is not a small claim.
24 This is a very, very major claim against the estate and I would
25 have expected counsel to deal with it responsibly -- your

1 opponent to deal with it responsibly.

2 MR. SMOLINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

4 MR. SMOLINSKY: No, sir.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Then have a good day.

6 MR. SMOLINSKY: Thank you.

7 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 10:16 a.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

R U L I N G S

DESCRIPTION	PAGE	LINE
Motors Liquidation's objection to claim of Ryan Hawkins on behalf of Barbara Hawkins granted with order to contain language: (a) removing reference to Mr. Watson's law firm; (b) that says estate need not reserve funds on account of this claim; and (c) that says a copy of the order was mailed both by first-class mail and by a second means that provides a proof of delivery	9	15
Debtors' objection to proof of claim no. 45631 filed by Steven Newman c/o Michael Green, deceased adjourned for seven days with no further extensions	13	13

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Lisa Bar-Leib, certify that the foregoing transcript is a
true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Lisa Bar-
Leib

Digitally signed by Lisa Bar-Leib
DN: cn=Lisa Bar-Leib, o, ou,
email=digital1@veritext.com,
c=US
Date: 2011.09.26 11:36:10 -04'00'

LISA BAR-LEIB

AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber (CET**D-486)

Veritext

200 Old Country Road

Suite 580

Mineola, NY 11501

Date: September 25, 2011